

REMARKS**§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama et al. (US2002/0007000) in view of Audsley (US4929403).

The Examiner acknowledges that Yokoyama et al. does not teach a flexible mold including a base layer made of a first curable material having a viscosity of 3,000 to 100,000 cps at 10 to 80°C and a coating layer made of a second curable material having a viscosity of not greater than 200 cps at 10 to 80°C.

The Examiner alleges that Audsley teaches such feature and stated that it would be obvious to modify Yokoyama's method to include Audsley's multilayered flexible mold.

The Applicant notes that col 3, lines 8-20 of Audsley states, "The process of the present invention includes coating at least a portion of the surface of a three-dimensional object with a fluid molding composition which is radiatively curable. Preferably, at least a predetermined thickness of the initial fluid molding composition is applied. The coating is cured by exposing the fluid coating to radiative energy for at least a period effective to form an elastic, flexible layer of cured molding composition on the three-dimensional object or model. It is desirable to repeat the coating and curing steps to build up the flexible mold until a predetermined minimum thickness has been attained, before the three-dimensional object is removed from the elastic, flexible mold."

However, Audsley does not teach a mold prepared from **two molding compositions having different viscosities as set forth in Applicant's claims**. Accordingly, assuming a motivation to combine these references does in fact exist, the combination of references does not arrive at Applicant's claimed invention.

Election/Restriction

Applicant affirms the election to prosecute the invention of Group 11, claim 7-10.

The Examiner stated that, “The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept . . . “. The examiner further stated that, “Claim 1 is either obvious over or anticipated by US 2002/0007000. Accordingly, the special technical feature linking the two inventions, a flexible mold, does not provide a contribution over the prior art, and no singles general inventive concept exists.”

Since Claim 1 is not obvious over or anticipated by US 2002/0007000 for the reasons discussed above and Group I and II both recite the same general inventive concept, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the restriction requirement.

New Claim 11 is also directed to the same invention concept as independent claims 1 and 7. Claim 11 is supported by the specification such as at by original claims 1 and 7 and p. 8, line 11 to p. 9, line 30.

The Applicant has responded to all the rejections set forth by the Examiner. In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

September 6, 2006

Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833